

Serial No. 09/769,380

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-25 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, and 14-25 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1- 25 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

In item 4 on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner alleged that it is unclear how or where the recited receiving is taking place.

By this Amendment, claim 25 has been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter of those claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 meets the requirements of §112, and further respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §112 rejection of claim 25.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 5-1 on pages 3-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, and 14-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (<http://www.ceantar.org/dicts/search.html>), hereinafter referred to as "Ceantar") in view of Hatakeyama et al. (US 5469354, hereinafter referred to as "Hatakeyama"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites a computer having a character input function which comprises an issuing section which "issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as the search targets while characters of the input character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined." Therefore, the search for the dictionary data can be performed during the time from when the characters are beginning to be input until the input characters of the character string are defined. In other words, the search can be started even in the state in which the input character string is not yet defined or definite. The

Serial No. 09/769,380

Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited references, either alone or together, disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

In the Response to Arguments section on pages 8-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Ceantar discloses "wherein said issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets during a time when said input characters of the character string are defined." However, Ceantar merely checks boxes for selecting the type of dictionary, an input field for inputting the keyword, and a start button for instructing the start of the search. Therefore, Ceantar does not disclose or suggest an issuing section which "issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as the search targets while characters of the input character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined."

Also, as Hatakeyama apparently merely discloses retrieving documents from a database, Hatakeyama does not cure the deficiencies of Ceantar in regards to the discussed features of claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, as neither of the cited references disclose or suggest at least the above recited feature of claim 1, a proper §103 rejection cannot be made. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claim 4 of the present application recites starting section which "starts the program while characters of the input character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined." As discussed in regard to claim 1 above, neither of the cited references disclose or suggest any starting of a program while the characters are being input until the character string is defined. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claims 8, 11, and 14-25 also recite similar features to those discussed in regard to claims 1 and 4. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 11, and 14-25 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Serial No. 09/769,380

In item 5-2 on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama and further in view of Brown et al. (US 6665838, hereinafter referred to as "Brown").

As discussed previously in this Amendment, claims 4 and 8 patentably distinguish over Ceantar and Hatakeyama. Further, as Brown apparently merely discloses modifying a page to indicate the presence of user criteria on a linked page and sending the modified page to a client, Brown does not cure the deficiencies of Ceantar and Hatakeyama in regard to claims 4 and 8. Therefore, as claims 5 and 9 depend from claims 4 and 8, respectively, and include all of the features of those respective claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 9 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 5-3 on pages 6-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama and further in view of Brandt et al. (US 6377993, hereinafter referred to as "Brandt").

As discussed previously in this Amendment, claims 4 and 11 patentably distinguish over Ceantar and Hatakeyama. Further, as Brandt apparently merely discloses displaying that a program cannot be started if errors are found in the input, Brandt does not cure the deficiencies of Ceantar and Hatakeyama in regard to claims 4 and 11. Therefore, as claims 6 and 12 depend from claims 4 and 11, respectively, and include all of the features of those respective claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 12 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 5-4 on pages 7-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 7, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar in view of Hatakeyama and further in view of Tran et al. (US 6157935, hereinafter referred to as "Tran").

As discussed previously in this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 8, and 11 patentably distinguish over Ceantar and Hatakeyama. Further, as Tran apparently merely discloses a stop button to cancel the loading of a page, Tran does not cure the deficiencies of Ceantar and Hatakeyama in regard to claims 1, 4, 8, and 11. Therefore, as claims 3, 7, 10, and 13 depend from claims 1, 4, 8, and 11, respectively, and include all of the features of those respective claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 7, 10, and 13 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Serial No. 09/769,380

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, and 14-25 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1- 25 are pending in the application and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 08/07/06By: Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being trans-
mitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 08/07, 2006
STAAS & HALSEY
By: Thomas L. Jones
Date: 08/07/06